

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 13-15 stand rejected. Claims 6, 9, and 12 have been objected to. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended. Claims 2, 6, 11, and 12 have been canceled. Claims 16-18 have been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-6 and 10-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 as being indefinite for reciting "first means" and "second means" without reciting corresponding functions. Claims 1, 7, and 10 have been amended, and claims 2 and 11 have been canceled, to more clearly point out the claimed invention. Claims 6 and 12 have been canceled for the reasons set forth below in the section entitled "Allowable Subject Matter." Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 10, and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto (U.S. Pat. No. 6,752,662) in view of Okada (U.S. Pat. No. 5,322,447). Claim 1, as amended, however, recites a device having a housing which includes a first and second connector and in which first and second outer shells of the connectors are integrally formed. The combination of Okamoto and Okada, however, neither teaches nor suggests such features. Applicant therefore traverses the rejection of claims 1-3 and respectfully requests that said rejection be withdrawn.

Okamoto, for example, discloses a housing 20 of a *single* connector 1. The single connector housing 20 defines an a single opening 21 for the single connector 1. Okamoto neither teaches nor

suggests a device having a housing which includes a first and second connector and in which first and second outer shells of the connectors are integrally formed, as recited by claim 1 of the present application.

Although Okada discloses a device having multiple connectors 1 and 2, Okada neither teaches nor suggests a device having a housing which includes a first and second connector and in which first and second outer shells of the connectors are integrally formed, as recited by claim 1 of the present application. Rather, as shown in FIG. 1 of Okada, connectors 1 and 2 have distinct housings 5a and 5b, respectively. Nothing in Okada suggests a housing in which housings 5a and 5b of connectors 1 and 2 are integrally formed. Because neither Okamoto nor Okada, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests a device having a housing which includes a first and second connector and in which first and second outer shells of the connectors are integrally formed, claim 1 of the present application patentably distinguishes over the combination of Okamoto and Okada.

Claims 4-5, 7-8, 10-11, and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto (U.S. Pat. No. 6,752,662) in view of Okada (U.S. Pat. No. 5,322,447) and Tan et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,475,021). These claims, as currently presented, include the same relevant limitations as claim 1 and patentably distinguish over the combination of Okamoto, Okada, and Tan for at least the same reasons.

Any dependent claims not specifically mentioned above include all of the limitations of the claims from which they depend, and therefore are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Allowable Subject Matter

The above-referenced Office Action stated that claims 6, 9, and 12 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 set forth in the Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 16-18 have been added to encompass this allowable subject matter, and original claims 6 and 12 have been canceled.

More specifically, newly-added claim 16 is equivalent to the originally-filed claim 6 rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Similarly, newly-added claim 17 is equivalent to the originally-filed claim 9 rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Finally, newly-added claim 18 is equivalent to the originally-filed claim 12 rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, newly-added claims 16-18 are allowable and a notice to that effect is hereby requested.

Conclusions

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this response, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the applicant's attorney at the phone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for extension of time is otherwise absent, applicant hereby requests any extension of time. Please charge any fees, or make any credits, to Deposit Account No. 501797.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert Plotkin, Esq.

Reg. No. 43,861


Robert Plotkin, P.C.

45 Butternut Circle

Concord, MA 01742-1937

Ph: (978) 318-9914

Email: rplotkin@rplotkin.com



Date